

REMARKS ON SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RHOPALOCERA.

By OSWALD B. LOWER, F.E.S., &c.

[Read May 1, 1894.]

In vol. XVII., Part II., Transactions of our Society, Mr. J. G. O. Tepper has given what purports to be a criticism, or reply, to my paper published in Part I. of the same volume. I shall remark on the species *seriatim*.

DELIAS AGANIPPE, *Don*.

The figure in Mr. Tepper's former paper (1881) either represents this or some fictitious species. It is certainly not "*Harpalyce*." I have the whole of the catalogued Australian species, and the figure approaches "*aganippe*" the most. If, as Mr. Tepper suggests, it may be "*argenthona*," all I can say is that such plates are very misleading and worse than useless. Some years ago I received a poor specimen of the latter species from Mr. Tepper under the name of "*aganippe*." This, I think, is how the confusion has occurred.

D. HARPALYCE, *Don*.

This has *not* been taken in South Australia up to the present.

D. ARGENTHONA, *Fab*.

This is essentially an Eastern Australian insect, and has not yet been recorded from Victoria. I should be very pleased to place it on the list, but the locality requires confirmatory information, Mr. Angas notwithstanding. It does seem strange that, with so many zealous (?) collectors, Mr. Tepper enumerates that this species has been overlooked (?) for so long.

BELENOIS PERIMALE, *Don*.

This I *did not* include in my list. It has never to my knowledge been taken in S.A. I have specimens from Port Darwin and Sydney; it does not occur in Victoria. As Miskin rightly points out, this is the var. of *Pieris scyllara*, Macleay; it has light-brown hindwings on the underside. Mr. Tepper exhibited at one of our meetings species of *Pieris teutonia* as this species, hence the confusion.

DANAIS PETILIA, *Stall*.

This is a widely different species from *chrysippus*, Linn. I saw in one of the Museum cases a specimen of a female *Hypolimnas*

missippus (as coming from S.A.) labelled in Mr. Tepper's handwriting as above, *i.e.*, *chrysisippus*; it is in this manner that errors of locality are recorded.

DANAIS ERIPPUS, *Cram.*

This may be a "notoriously modern introduction," but it is *not* "sporadic."

XENICA ACHANTA, *Don.*

This was *not* in Mr. Tepper's list, hence my reason for mentioning it.

PYRAMEIS ITEA, *Fal.*

Of this species Mr. Tepper says, "The stinging nettle cannot have been the original food-plant of this species." I did not say it was the *original* food-plant, but I did say that the species feeds on it, and can be reared in the usual manner. My Notes were intended as a guide to future students.

P. KERSHAWI, *McCoy.*

I always admitted that this species is a very slightly divergent form of "*cardui*." My reason for adopting the first name was on account of it being better known, and out of respect to Prof. McCoy. Mr. Tepper misconstrues my remarks when he says that "dry cowdung" cannot be the proper shelter of the chrysalides of this species. I simply mentioned the fact as being of general interest to collectors, and never thought for an instant that it was the "proper" shelter, but more likely an adaptation to circumstances.

JUNONIA VELLIDA, *Fal.*

The word "*Junonisa*" is wrong. I should have thought Mr. Tepper would have noticed the error.

LUCIA LUCANUS, *Fabr.*

Most of the genera of Lycænidae are not separated by very slight differences, as Mr. Tepper would have us believe. It is not my intention to write a dissertation on the family, but I could point out well-marked differences in the genera *Polyommatus*, *Cupido*, *Lucia*, &c. The "qualifying terms" are *not* exaggerated in this instance. For the benefit of Mr. Tepper and others not conversant with the species I may mention that "*lucanus*" is in general appearance very like *Lycæna agricola*, D. & H., but has a fiery copper discal area; in "*aurifer*" the shape of wings is quite different; in fact, as dissimilar as can be, being in shape like *Euchloris (Iodis) bipunctifera*, Walk., with its peculiar angulated hindwing. The chequered cilia of "*lucanus*"

is wanting in *aurifer*. I strongly suspect Mr. Tepper has not yet seen the true "*aurifer*," but is referring to "*ænea*," Miskin. Sir W. MacLeay did *not* confuse two species when he gave Mr. Tepper the name "*discifer*," H. S., this name, as I mentioned, being synonymic with "*lucanus*." Kirby's Synonymic Catalogue, quoted by Mr. Tepper, is not a masterpiece on the subject, and sadly requires revising. Mr. Tepper has misconstrued my remarks with regard to this species frequenting "Stinkwort." It is incorrect to say I "suggested" this as being the food-plant. I mentioned the fact of its "frequenting" stinkwort for the benefit of those interested in our branch of Natural History, and the reference is not misleading.

OGYRIS, *Westw.*

Before making any remarks in answer to Mr. Tepper's criticisms, I would advise him to study Miskin's revision of the genus (Proc. Linn. Soc., N.S.W., 1890), wherein the doubts and differences of several species are set at rest. What I wrote on this genus is substantially correct, and admits of no doubt, with the exception perhaps of *O. amaryllis*. In reference to this species, I have recently received a communication from Mr. E. Guest, of Hoyleton, stating that he has taken this species and "*orates*" *in cop.* This almost convinces me that they are one and the same species, but what I cannot understand is the well-marked difference on the underside of the two species. In the sexes of all the other species the markings of the underside are identical, and it seems very strange that such expert Lepidopterists as Hewitson and Miskin should make mistakes. Miskin says Hewitson's figures represent *females* of both "*orates*" and "*amaryllis*." Mr. Tepper says it is the *male* "*orates*" which is shown. I possess what is said to be female "*orates*." It is the identical species which Miskin identified and based his conclusions on, but really I must acknowledge that the specimen is not in a condition to decide with any accuracy as to it being a *female*, as Miskin makes it. In conclusion, I may here say that I intend to keep the two(?) species separate until confirmatory evidence is forthcoming to show that they are one and the same species. I think that Mr. Tepper's remarks respecting "*idmo*" and "*halmaturia*" call for no special remarks, but as he has challenged my decisions I must retaliate. I here again state that the so-called *female* "*halmaturia*," Tepp., is the *male* of *idmo*, Hew., and the so-called *male* "*halmaturia*" is identical with Felder's figure of the *male* "*otanes*." Miskin is in error in supposing it, *i.e.*, *otanes*, to be a small form of "*genoveva*." Any one has only to compare the published descriptions of the above-mentioned species to see that there is no difference. Kirby's inclusion of Hewitson's "*otrontas*" (I pre-

sume Mr. Tepper means "*orontas*") with "*idmo*" is either a misprint or mistake, and intended, it seems to me, for "*otanes*," as *orontas* is *without* the large pale spot of the forewing of the female—*vide* Mr. Tepper. The female "*orontas*" has a dull white sub-apical patch on the forewing. So has "*idmo*." So that it is Mr. Tepper's ideas which are "fanciful," and not mine. This I am prepared to prove at any time, only stipulating that he who is in the wrong shall acknowledge the error in the Transactions of this Society. Mr. Tepper's concluding remarks respecting "*amaryllis*" being probably "sporadic," express his private opinion.
